

REMARKS

Period for response

Applicants submit that the period for response to the outstanding Ex Parte Quayle action should have been set by the Examiner to 2 MONTHS (See MPEP 710.02 (b)) rather than to 1 MONTH / 30 days. It appears that the period for response was erroneously set by the Office due to a misclassification of the outstanding Ex Parte Quayle office action in PAIR as Requirement for Restriction/Election. Applicants request that the period for response be adjusted and reset accordingly. Applicants submit also that this response is timely filed on or before December 23, 2007.

Claims 1-4 are pending in the application and stand in condition for allowance. Claims 1 and 3 are being amendment to coincide with paragraph [0016] of the description. A new set of drawings is being submitted. Amendments to the drawings are related to reference numbers and are being amended to show the features of claims. Applicants believe that no new matter is being added.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicants note that the Examiner acknowledged a claim to foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f) to Polish Patent Application No. P-358050 filed December 30, 2002 and confirmed that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

All outstanding requirements will now be addressed in the order they appear in the Office Action mailed October 23, 2007.

1. Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner considers the application in condition for allowance except for formal matters. Applicants respectfully submit that the application has been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections.

2. The drawings are objected to for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). Applicants have amended the drawings to obviate the Examiner's objection and have added reference characters used in the description.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited. Should an extension of time be required, Applicants hereby petition for same and request that the extension fee and any other fee required for timely consideration of this submission be charged to Deposit Account No. 503182. Applicants submit, however, that this response is timely filed on or before December 23, 2007 and no extension fees are due as the period for response to an Ex Parte Quayle action should have been set by the Examiner to 2 MONTHS (See MPEP 710.02 (b)). It appears that the period for response was erroneously set by the Office due to a misclassification of the outstanding Ex Parte Quayle office action in PAIR as Requirement for Restriction/Election.

Customer Number: **33,794**

Respectfully Submitted,

/Matthias Scholl/

Dr. Matthias Scholl, Esq.
Reg. No. 54,947
Attorney of Record

Date: December 21, 2007